

Advice**A Library
For Mere
100 Bucks**

A complete home reference library can be purchased for the sum of \$100, and this amount does not have to be shelled out all at once, according to John D. Henderson, county librarian.

For example, he divides the list of books into three groups, with the first section costing only \$25.

This includes an authorized King James version of the Bible, an abridged college edition dictionary, a one-volume encyclopedia, an annual almanac, an illustrated world atlas, and gazetteer with descriptive text, a late edition cook book, and an American Red Cross First Aid book.

This list, Henderson says, was selected to help Junior with his school homework, and not as promotion for book publishers.

However, he warns that an encyclopedia should be purchased with great care, suggesting that the prospective buyer consult the city or county public library for an appraisal.

For another 25 bucks Henderson recommends an anthology of poetry, the complete works of Shakespeare in one volume, an introduction to art, an encyclopedia of music, a book of etiquette, a manual of world history, a book on United States Government, formulas and recipes for the home, farm and workshop, and a thesaurus of the English language.

The remaining \$50 can be used for a history of the United States, a biographical dictionary of famous men and women, a book of quotations and proverbs, one of the good volumes on household mechanics, a book on application of science to everyday life, a digest of great literary works, and an outline of English literature.

**L. A. Councilman
Seeks Bay Acreage
For Incinerator**

While many districts in the city are fighting against rubbish incinerators in their areas, Councilman George Moore of Los Angeles is asking the city council to take some action whereby a tract of land of about 23 acres, owned by the city in the bay area, but used by the federal government, be returned to the control of the city council.

Moore declared that this is an ideal site for an incinerator and that the district needs it and wants it, but has been running "into red tape" when it comes to taking the matter up with federal authorities.

Exact location of the property was not disclosed.

**Steelworkers Set
Low Mishap Mark**

Steelworkers had fewer accidents on the job in 1948 than ever before, according to an American Iron and Steel Institute study of data published by the National Safety Council.

With an accident frequency rate four per cent lower than in 1947, steel was the fourth safest among 40 major industries. For twelve consecutive years steel has ranked among the five safest in accident frequency.

Steel's accident frequency rate was 5.86 per million manhours worked. That figure was 49 per cent lower than the average for all industries.

**\$5000
POLIO
POLICY**

ONLY **\$10**
FOR 2 YEARS

for your
Entire Family



Luard CO.
INSURANCE
1425 1/2 Marcelina
Torrance
Next to Post Office
PHONE 356

WHY A STEEL STRIKE?

United States Steel wants to do what is right by its employees. We have always sought the loyal cooperation and friendship of our employees.

United States Steel favors proper programs of insurance, welfare, and pensions for its employees. We have had insurance and pension plans in effect for many years. We are ready and willing to try to work out with the Union through collective bargaining any changes in our existing programs for insurance and pensions which are now necessary or desirable.

We made an offer to the Union to pay as our share of the cost of programs of insurance and pensions to be negotiated with the Union up to an average of 4 cents an hour for insurance and 6 cents an hour for pensions. That was a very substantial offer on our part. It would provide at our expense insurance and welfare benefits which our employees do not presently enjoy. The adoption of such programs would add more than \$50,000,000 annually to our costs of operation.

The Union flatly rejected this liberal proposal and called a strike against us. Why? Simply because United States Steel is not willing to agree in advance that it will pay the entire cost of insurance and pensions for its employees.

Because of the Union's adamant stand that we must pay the entire cost of insurance and pensions for employees, the Union has deprived our employees of an opportunity immediately to obtain, without additional cost to them, insurance protection far superior to that which the employees now possess.

United States Steel proposes to pay as its share of the cost of an insurance program about \$5.70 a month for each participating employee. A single employee would pay as his share about \$2 a month and an employee with dependents about \$3 a month

Our employees on the average are now paying under existing welfare arrangements more than these amounts each month for lesser benefits. The payments by our employees under the proposed insurance program would not reduce their present take-home pay.

A proper and financially sound pension plan calls for more careful consideration. United States Steel has offered to join with the Union in making a joint study of pensions, and, upon the completion of this study, to negotiate with the Union for a pension plan to be included in a new labor contract, effective on May 1, 1950. As an indication of its good faith, United States Steel has offered to pay up to 6 cents an hour as its share of the cost of a mutually satisfactory contributory plan. Here again, the Union flatly rejected our proposal.

The only issue in the present steel strike is this:

Shall United States Steel be forced now to agree that it must pay the entire cost of insurance, welfare benefits and pensions for its employees? An assumption by the employer of complete financial responsibility would amount to the adoption of a major and highly costly principle, probably for all time. Moreover, such action by a large steel company would probably set a pattern for all American business. There is grave doubt as to the financial ability of American industry alone to pay the cost of adequate insurance and pension programs for employees. Furthermore, is it not in the best interests of the employee that he participate in the creation of a savings account for his future welfare?

Social security in which both employer and employee share the cost has been the established order in this country for many years, as evidenced by the Federal Social Security Act.

Why should our employees and the whole nation suffer the disastrous consequences of a steel strike, from which the employees have so little to gain?

UNITED STATES STEEL